



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,447	11/20/2003	David M. Salcedo	C4-1114	9828
26799	7590	07/13/2006	EXAMINER	
IP LEGAL DEPARTMENT TYCO FIRE & SECURITY SERVICES ONE TOWN CENTER ROAD BOCA RATON, FL 33486			LAI, ANNE VIET NGA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2612	

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/718,447

Applicant(s)

SALCEDO ET AL.

Examiner

Anne V. Lai

Art Unit

2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 44-86 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 44-86 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 44-50, 53-64, 65-71, 74-76, 77-82, 85-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by **Monroe1** [US. 2004/0117638] or; in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over **Monroe1** in view of **Monroe2** [US. 6,518,881], or; over **Anthony** alone or in view of **Piccioni** (see previous office action) or **Monroe2**.

In claim 44, **Monroe1** discloses a security system comprising at least a video surveillance camera (figs. 3-4, 8; claim 5); an object recognition system coupled to the camera to receive video signal (par. 143; server in claims 6-7); a PDA (43, fig. 4; claim 10) wirelessly coupled to the object recognition system and the camera, the PDA including at least one data collection device to acquire non-image data (barcode scanner, par. 272) (abstract; par. 24-30, par. 146-151, 155-172, 200-205; claims 1-10). **Monroe2** teaches the PDA for a law enforcement personnel including non-image data collection device (barcode scanner, magnetic stripe reader, figure 2, col. 6, l. 41- col. 7, l. 12).

In claim 44, **Anthony** discloses a security system comprising at least a video surveillance camera 10 (figs. 1, 7; col. 18, l. 22-37); an object recognition system for receiving video signal from the camera (data collection and remote control server 230, fig. 7; col. 17, l. 59- col. 18, l. 21); a PDA wirelessly coupled to the object recognition system and the camera (Fig. 6 shows communication between PDAs on fixed sites and on mobile vehicles; subscriber PDA, col. 15, l. 29-45; col. 16, l. 20-59; on site mobile unit 5 in figs. 1, 2 and 7, comprising a PDA or handheld computer 14 for use by mobile controller); and a hand-operated wand for check-in baggage and badge identification also being used in addition to video cameras to increase the effectiveness of the security system (col. 18, line 25; col. 19, line 16). It would have been obvious the wand or the badge reader can be a PDA by itself because it is a handheld device containing processor to assist a user in performing a particular function; integrating a plurality of processors to perform a plurality of functions is based on designer choice for purpose of space and cost saving.

Piccioni teaches a mobile entity device 12 used by law enforcement officers for tracking and reporting events comprising a video camera, a display and a scanner integrated in a PDA (col. 2, lines 13-47). It would have been obvious the hand-operated wand for check-in baggage or ID badge is very commonly used at the security airport for ID code or non-image data scanning; and the integrated PDA provides convenient for the user by its condensed sized with multiple functions.

In claims 45-46, **Monroe**¹ discloses video recording (par. 149).

In claim 47, **Monroe1** discloses PDA with display (43, fig. 4; Monroe2, 20 in fig. 2).

In claims 48-50, **Monroe1** discloses surveillance camera, object recognition system provide detection signal in response to an object entering the surveillance area; video record the object, and compare data representative of the object with data stored in a database (par. 24-30, 146-150).

In claims 53-55, **Monroe1** discloses the object recognition system provides identification signal to the PDA if there is a match with stored data, alarm generate by PDA, and video recorder provides recorded video to the PDA in response to the identification signal (par. 155-172).

In claims 56-59, **Monroe1** discloses peripheral device in communication with PDA for access control, metal detection and alarm (par. 171-172, 260).

In claims 60, 62-63, **Monroe2** discloses an integrated PDA with barcode scanner and digital camera (col. 6, l. 41-col. 7, l. 12).

In claim 61, **Anthony** discloses a data collection device 10 can be removable connected to a PDA (hand-held computer 14, fig. 1, col. 5, l. 61-67; col. 10, l. 29-43).

In claim 64, **Monroe2** teaches proximity card detector (magnetic stripe reader, col. 6, l. 61).

In claim 65, **Monroe2** or **Anthony** combined discloses a method or providing security information using the system of claim 44 above, comprising generating live video of a surveillance area; communicating live video via wireless connection to a PDA; acquiring non-image data and displaying live video and non-image data on the

Art Unit: 2612

PDA. (**Monroe**, abstract; figs. 4, 7; par. 270, 272; claims 1-10; **Anthony**, figs. 6-7; col. 15, l. 29-45; col. 18, lines 5-8).

In claims 66-71 and 74-76, **Monroe2** or **Anthony** combined discloses detecting object entry into surveillance area, comparing, recording, displaying recorded video segment at the PDA of particular officers or controllers or subscribers (**Monroe2**, abstract; par. 200-205; **Anthony**, fig. 6; col. 8, lines 37-59; col. 17, line 59 – col. 20, line 39).

In claims 77-82 and 85-86, **Monroe2** or **Anthony** combined discloses the method as claimed for the reason stated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 51-52, 72-73 and 83-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Monroe1** or **Anthony** combined in view of **Swanson** [US. 5,689,442).

In claims 51-52, 72-73 and 83-84, **Monroe2** or **Anthony** combined fails to disclose store only the video segment that matches the stored data and discard video segment that does not matched the stored data associated with an identified object; **Swanson** teaches a surveillance system stores only the events of interest and deletes

Art Unit: 2612

information that no longer wanted to make room in storage for subsequently captured information (abstract). In light of Swanson teaching, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to storing only the video segment of interest and discard the video segment that is not wanted for saving storage area and therefore reducing cost.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 5/23/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the PDA of Anthony does not have a non-image data collector; and the scanner in the PDA of Piccioni is used to scan image. The examiner disagrees. Both Anthony and Piccioni disclose a PDA having a video camera attached. Further Anthony discloses a hand-operated wand and a badge identification device (col. 18, l. 25; col. 19, l. 16). Anthony does not specify about the data collected is image data or non-image data. If the hand-operated wand is for detecting metal as applicant assumed, then it is a non-image data collector. The badge identification device is in general for reading identification number assigned to particular person wearing a badge, therefore it is a code reader and not an image reader. Piccioni discloses the PDA further includes a scanner but does not specify whether a barcode scanner or an image scanner. However, the reason for combining Anthony PDA with Piccioni PDA is for showing that beside video camera other data collecting devices can be integrated into a PDA such as the PDA of Piccioni could be applied to the PDA of

Art Unit: 2612

Anthony and the use of the scanner or badge reader for reading non-image or image is based on designer choice for particular application.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Brooks ([0042]-[0047]) teaches a security system 200 (fig.2) comprising a camera configured to generate a video signal (security camera [0027], scanning face in a crowd [0039]), an object recognition system (surveillance analysis 224) configured to receive video signal from the camera (through biometric processing equipment 214 and wireless network 210); and a portable PDA (218, [0031], [0044]) wirelessly coupled to the object recognition system and the camera; the PDA receives also information from a data collection device configured to acquire non-image data (proximity card reader and key code access 254, fig. 2, [0043]). [US. 2003/0210139]

Buinevicius (figs 1-3, 9; par. 30, 36, 38, 42), teaches a security system comprising a video camera (capture 110, fig. 1, camera 220, fig. 2; [0036], [0040]); an object recognition system (analysis 130, fig. 1; analysis component, [0039], fig. 3) configured to receive video signal from the camera; a portable PDA (210, fig. 2; [0037]-[0038]) wirelessly coupled to the object recognition system and the camera; the PDA also receives non-image data from a bar code scanner [0042]. [US. 2004/0093349]

Ortiz discloses a security system comprising camera (par. 104) and smart card reader (par. 90-98) coupled to a PDA (par. 99). [US. 2003/0163710]

Art Unit: 2612

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anne V. Lai whose telephone number is 571-272-2974.

The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 am to 6:30 pm, Monday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hofsass Jeffery can be reached on 571-272-2981. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AVL
7/3/06



JEFFERY HOFSSASS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600